

Meeting Notes

Evaluation of the MUN beneficial use in Agriculturally Dominated Water Bodies

September 12, 2013

9:00 AM -12:00 PM

Location: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board Office, 11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670: Training Room

Attendees:

California Department of Public Health – Ali Rezvani (*by phone*), Richard Hinrichs (*by phone*)

California Rice Commission - Roberta Firoved

California Urban Water Agencies – Elaine Archibald

Central Valley Clean Water Association – Debbie Webster

Central Valley Water Board - Anne Littlejohn, Jeanne Chilcott, Susan Fregien

City of Live Oak – Bill Lewis

City of Willows – Skylar Lipski

J.G. Boswell Company – Dennis Tristao (*by phone*)

Larry Walker and Associates – Betsy Elzufan (*by phone*), Tom Grovhoug

Metropolitan Water District – Lynda Smith

Parsons Brinckerhoff – Bori Touray

Sacramento River Joint Source Water Protection Program – Bonny Starr

San Joaquin River Group Authority – Dennis Westcot

South San Joaquin Irrigation District – Jim Atherstone

State Water Resources Control Board – Diane Barclay

Turlock Irrigation District – Debbie Liebersbach

Meeting Summary

Continued Discussion on Monitoring/Surveillance

- Central Valley Water Board staff provided an informational document containing the Monitoring and Surveillance information such as the legal requirements, potential alternatives and program information, including objectives, for existing programs (Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination, Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program). In addition, maps and monitoring parameters were provided for areas in the Sacramento Archetype Study Area (constituents, sites, frequencies).
- The first portion of the discussion addressed the objectives and criteria of the Monitoring and Surveillance for the proposed Basin Plan Amendment. Comments were as follows:
 - Two objectives for the Monitoring and Surveillance portion of the Basin Plan Amendment should be:
 - Meet the monitoring requirements of the Sources of Drinking Water Policy (Resolution 88-63)
 - Ensure that downstream water bodies with the MUN beneficial use are protected consistent with the Anti-degradation policy (e.g. to the maximum benefit of the people of the state).
 - Monitoring criteria identified included:
 - Monitoring should be upstream of known diversions, near the points of discharge.

- Caution against picking a site too far from an intake as it may not take into account other inputs. Must consider which location(s) will provide the most valuable information.
 - Consider putting a trigger value that is lower than the water quality objective in the MUN receiving water body to initiate follow-up evaluation of the discharge upstream.
 - Ensure that any new permit must evaluate potential impacts to downstream water bodies with the MUN beneficial use as well as other appropriate beneficial uses. Specifically, include language in the Basin Plans that clarify the requirements of the Reasonable Potential Analysis (RPA) in NPDES permits.
 - needs to consider locations, constituents, frequency and follow-up actions (what happens if a constituent does not meet water quality objectives? Can monitoring decrease over time if there are no exceedances?).
- Additional Considerations:
 - Flexibility to participate in an existing monitoring program, regional effort or solo effort to fulfill monitoring requirements.
 - Discharge should be monitored prior to its discharge into the receiving water body with the MUN beneficial use – at least initially, to capture impact.
 - Flexibility should be built into the amendment so that specific locations and constituents are not set in stone and instead can be changed over time to account for changing conditions.
- Participants reviewed maps and monitoring parameters for existing programs in the Sacramento study area to facilitate feedback on what type of adjustments and/or additional monitoring should be considered to satisfy the objectives and criteria identified. Comments were as follows:
 - Drinking water purveyors have very specific water quality monitoring requirements. These deal with both raw and treated water and include a large suite of MUN-related constituents. The majority of purveyors monitor the raw water supply and are particularly interested in the iron and manganese content as those elements may upset their treatment processes. Initially, the large list of constituents (114) is monitored for

four consecutive quarters , considered the “routine” phase. This is followed by the “reduced” phase consisting of annual monitoring for three years. Subsequently, it is possible for low risk constituents to be “waived” from further monitoring based on the results from the first two phases. An assessment is made every five years to reevaluate the water quality and identify potential vulnerabilities. Increased constituent concentrations have typically been associated with changes in water year type rather than specific changes in discharge activities. The suggestion was made to model the Basin Plan Amendment monitoring program after this tiered monitoring approach.

- Concern expressed as to extent and necessity of requiring this type of tiered monitoring if the monitoring is already being conducted by drinking water purveyors. Suggestion to add a component to the Basin Plan requiring review of their evaluations and those of other programs like the NPDES and IRLP at regular intervals and adjust future monitoring based on results.
- Feedback specific to the Sacramento Archetype Study area included:
 - Consider proposed intake locations in the Sacramento River for the cities of Woodland and Davis if developing specific sites.
 - Consider pesticides that are not included in the IRLP monitoring plans and periods of vulnerability.
 - Consider potential of dioxin impacts from recent fires.
 - Consider cumulative impacts of constituents of concern from discharges like the four POTWs who have had exceedances such as nitrates and aluminium as well as non-point sources throughout the Sacramento Valley.
 - Review water quality results from other existing programs and monitor for constituents that have been identified as having the potential to negatively impact downstream water bodies instead of reinventing the wheel by starting a brand new monitoring program.
 - Do not require POTWs to monitor at locations 80+ miles downstream from their facilities.
 - Do not lose sight of the research that has been conducted over several decades from entities like the California Rice Commission that have identified constituents of concern in Ag dominated water bodies in the Sacramento Valley.

- While the Sacramento River archetype areas are focusing on Ag drains, do not lose sight of how this policy will affect Ag supply channels. Ag districts do not want a new and expensive monitoring program.

Action Items:

- *Participants will submit any further written comments to Central Valley Water Board staff by the end of September 2013.*

Project Schedule and Future Meetings

- No stakeholder meetings over the next 6+ months while Central Valley Water Board staff work to identify project alternatives for evaluation and develop the draft Staff Report.
- A consultant has been chosen to conduct environmental and economic review. A contract has not been finalized yet.
- Stakeholders and public will be kept up to date on progress of the project and there will be a meeting(s) or public workshop(s) following the development of the draft staff report in 2014.
- Estimated time to present a proposed Basin Plan Amendment to the Regional Board remains scheduled for late 2014.

Action Items:

- *Central Valley Water Board staff will work with CV-SALTS to bring selected consultant under contract to conduct the CEQA and Economic evaluation for the proposed Basin Plan Amendment.*
- *Central Valley Water Board staff will work with the consultant to firm up the project alternatives to be presented in the draft staff report.*